

REMARKS**Summary of the Office Action**

Claims 1 and 3 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C § 102(e) as being anticipated by Shimizu et al. (US 6,608,332).

Claims 13 and 15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being anticipated by Shimizu et al.

Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for the indication that claims 2, 4-6, 14, and 16-18 recite allowable subject matter.

Summary of the Response to the Office Action

Applicants have amended claims 1, 3, 13, and 15 to further define the invention. Accordingly, claims 1-24 are pending for consideration with claims 7-12 and 19-24 having been withdrawn from consideration.

All Claims Define Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 1 and 3 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C § 102(e) as being anticipated by Shimizu et al. (US 6,608,332), and claims 13 and 15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being anticipated by Shimizu et al. Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections as being based upon a reference that neither teaches nor suggests the novel combination of features recited by independent claims 1, 3, 13, and 15 as amended, and hence dependent claims 2, 4-6, 14, and 16-18.

Independent claims 1 and 3, as amended, both recite a backlight device for a liquid crystal display including, in part, “white light emitting diodes disposed *exclusively* at both ends of the configuration of the green, blue, and red light emitting diodes.” Similarly, independent claims 13

and 15, as amended, both recite a method of fabricating a backlight device for a liquid crystal display including, in part, “white light emitting diodes disposed *exclusively* at both ends of the configuration of the green, blue, and red light emitting diodes.”

In contrast to Applicants’ claimed invention, the LED arrangement disclosed in FIG. 12 of Shimizu et al. explicitly requires placement of white LEDs 403 centered within each sub-arrangement of R, G, and B LEDs 401, 402, and 404. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully assert that Shimizu et al. fails to teach or suggest “white light emitting diodes disposed *exclusively* at both ends of the configuration of the green, blue, and red light emitting diodes,” as required by amended independent claims 1, 3, 13, and 15, and hence dependent claims 2, 4-6, 14, and 16-18. Thus, Applicants respectfully request that the rejections under 35 U.S.C §§ 102(e) and 103(a) in view of Shimizu et al. be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and the timely allowance of the pending claims. Should the Examiner feel that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of the response, the Examiner is invited to contact the Applicants’ undersigned representative to expedite prosecution.

If there are any other fees due in connection with the filing of this response, please charge the fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-0310. If a fee is required for an extension of time under

ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.: 041501-5580


Application No.: 10/670,057

Page 13

37 C.F.R. § 1.136 not accounted for above, such an extension is requested and the fee should also be charged to our Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP

By: 
David B. Hardy
Reg. No. 47,362

Dated: December 2, 2005

CUSTOMER NO. 09629

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP

1111 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.

Washington, D.C. 20004

Telephone: (202) 739-3000